



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/739,357	12/19/2000	Craig S. Aman	10003506	3380

29139 7590 11/27/2002

PHILIPS ELECTRONICS NORTH AMERICAN
580 WHITE PLAINS ROAD
TARRYTOWN, NY 10591

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

SOTOMAYOR, JOHN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3714	

DATE MAILED: 11/27/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/739,357	Applicant(s) AMAN, CRAIG S.
	Examiner John L Sotomayor	Art Unit 3714
-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --		
Period for Reply		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). 		
Status		
<p>1)<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>12 September 2002</u>.</p> <p>2a)<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> This action is FINAL. 2b)<input type="checkbox"/> This action is non-final.</p> <p>3)<input type="checkbox"/> Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i>, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.</p>		
Disposition of Claims		
<p>4)<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) <u>1-43</u> is/are pending in the application.</p> <p>4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.</p> <p>5)<input type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.</p> <p>6)<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) <u>1-43</u> is/are rejected.</p> <p>7)<input type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.</p> <p>8)<input type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.</p>		
Application Papers		
<p>9)<input type="checkbox"/> The specification is objected to by the Examiner.</p> <p>10)<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The drawing(s) filed on <u>19 December 2000</u> is/are: a)<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> accepted or b)<input type="checkbox"/> objected to by the Examiner.</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).</p> <p>11)<input type="checkbox"/> The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)<input type="checkbox"/> approved b)<input type="checkbox"/> disapproved by the Examiner.</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.</p> <p>12)<input type="checkbox"/> The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.</p>		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120		
<p>13)<input type="checkbox"/> Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</p> <p>a)<input type="checkbox"/> All b)<input type="checkbox"/> Some * c)<input type="checkbox"/> None of:</p> <p>1.<input type="checkbox"/> Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</p> <p>2.<input type="checkbox"/> Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.</p> <p>3.<input type="checkbox"/> Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</p> <p>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</p> <p>14)<input type="checkbox"/> Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).</p> <p>a)<input type="checkbox"/> The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.</p> <p>15)<input type="checkbox"/> Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.</p>		
Attachment(s)		
<p>1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)</p> <p>2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</p> <p>3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____</p> <p>4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____</p> <p>5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)</p> <p>6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____</p>		

DETAILED ACTION***Response to Amendment***

1. In response to the Amendment filed September 12, 2002, claims 1-43 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
1. Claims 1,4,5,7-10,12-14,16,18-19,21-24,26,27,30-31,33-36,38 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Hon (US 6,074,213).
 2. Regarding claims 1 and 27, Hon discloses a system, method and apparatus for the training of users of a medical system. Hon discloses that educational instructions are pre-loaded into the system and available for recall by users of the system contacting the rule-based expert system component (Col 3, lines 16-44). The instructions and simulation information are provided to the users via a plurality of displays on graphical user interfaces over networked

devices. (Col 4, lines 56-64, Fig 11). Hon discloses generating feedback to supply information to team members using the medical device (Col 11, lines 36-38). Hon does not specifically disclose that the feedback is used to indicate the correctness of the use of the medical device. However, it is common and well-known practice to utilize a feedback loop for informing users as to the correct use of any device in which feedback has been implemented. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of invention to extend an existing feedback information stream to include informing users as to the correct use of a medical device.

3. Regarding claims 4,18,30, and 40 Hon discloses a system and method within which the display stations, which interact with a user through a Graphical User Interface (GUI), are equipped with a voice interface for audio interaction with the user (Col 4, line 61, Col 15, lines 39-41).

4. Regarding claims 5,19, and 31, Hon discloses that the instructional system and method may use the Internet and intranets for communication between users (Col 16, lines 11-16). Hon does not specifically state that the navigation capability of the GUI in use by the system and method is linear and non-linear. However, it is common and well known to use a web browser as a means of navigation on Internet capable display devices. Inherent to a web browser is the capacity for linear and non-linear navigation from web page to web page. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide linear and non-linear navigation capability to any system and method utilizing the Internet for connectivity between users.

5. Regarding claims 7-9, 12,13,21-23,33-35, Hon discloses that the instructional information from the expert system may be provided to the users through visual means, including images, video and animation of the subjects in use (Fig 17, Col 14, lines 36-46).

6. Regarding claims 10, 24, and 36, Hon discloses a simulator with a rule-based expert system that provides a view of various team performance actions in relation to the medical task presented, thus providing the operational steps of a task in proper sequential order (Col 16, lines 23-25).

7. Regarding claim 14, Hon discloses an educational system with a network, user computers coupled to the network, and a server with educational instructions pre-loaded into the system and available for recall by users of the system contacting the rule-based expert system component (Col 3, lines 16-44). The instructions and simulation information are provided to the users via a plurality of displays on graphical user interfaces over networked devices. (Col 4, lines 56-64, Fig 11). Hon discloses generating feedback to supply information to team members using the medical device (Col 11, lines 36-38). Hon does not specifically disclose that the feedback is used to indicate the correctness of the use of the medical device. However, it is common and well-known practice to utilize a feedback loop for informing users as to the correct use of any device in which feedback has been implemented. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of invention to extend an existing feedback information stream to include informing users as to the correct use of a medical device.

8. Regarding claim 16, Hon discloses a system capably connected either through the Internet or over an intranet (Col 16, lines 11-16).

9. Regarding claim 26, Hon discloses educational system instructions on a computer readable medium used with a network, a plurality of user computers coupled to the network, and a server with educational instructions pre-loaded into the system and available for recall by users of the system contacting the rule-based expert system component (Col 3, lines 16-44). The

instructions and simulation information are provided to the users via a plurality of displays on graphical user interfaces over networked devices. (Col 4, lines 56-64, Fig 11). Hon discloses generating feedback to supply information to team members using the medical device (Col 11, lines 36-38). Hon does not specifically disclose that the feedback is used to indicate the correctness of the use of the medical device. However, it is common and well-known practice to utilize a feedback loop for informing users as to the correct use of any device in which feedback has been implemented. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of invention to extend an existing feedback information stream to include informing users as to the correct use of a medical device.

10. Regarding claim 38, Hon discloses an instructional method simulating the control of medical devices under the direction of a rule-based expert system, simulating the first aid use of the medical device and providing feedback to the user concerning the correct results from the device (Col 9, lines 5-44).

11. Claims 2,5-6,11,15,19-20,25,28,31-32,37, 39 and 41-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hon in view of Parker et al (US 6,321,113).

12. Regarding claims 2,5-6,11,15,25,28,37, and 39, Hon discloses a defibrillator station in which an external defibrillator may be inserted for use by the medical team. Hon does not specifically disclose that the defibrillator is an Automated External Defibrillator. However, Parker et al teaches that for a good networked connection at a remote site from the main analysis computer an Automated External Defibrillator is preferred (Col 3, lines 42-64). The AED taught by Parker et al has the networked features that would allow it to be seamlessly integrated into the defibrillator station disclosed by Hon. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art at the time of invention to include an AED as the preferred defibrillation device in the training system.

13. Regarding claims 6, 20, and 32, Hon discloses a system and method for instructional connection and communication between users of physically separate medical devices, each user of which has a physical display device. Hon does not specifically disclose that the instructional information provided to users of the system is in text format. However, Parker et al teaches a physically remote AED device connected via a network connection to a remote computer that provides instruction displayed to the user in text format (Col 3, lines 35-40, Fig 1). The system and method disclosed by Hon indicates a rule-based expert system that assists with instruction and the system and method taught by Parker et al displays the rules for the system use as text retrieved from a rules database. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to provide instructional information from the rules database on the steps necessary to utilize a connected medical device in text format on the GUI.

14. Regarding claims 41-43, Hon discloses that the instructional information from the expert system may be provided to the users through visual means, including images, video and animation of the subjects in use (Fig 17, Col 14, lines 36-46). Hon does not specifically disclose that text description is associated with the visual means of instructing users. However, Parker et al teaches that both graphical and textual data of interest to the medical use in progress may be represented on a single screen for use of medical practitioners (Col 5, lines 15-26). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to provide a text description of one or more steps associated with the graphical representation pertaining to operation of the medical device. Combining the system disclosed by Hon with the teaching of

Parker et al produces a medical training device that provides users with textual description of a visual image for a more robust training experience.

15. Claims 3,17, and 29, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hon in view of Parker et al in further view of Olson et al (US 5,645,571). Hon discloses that a plurality of medical devices may be attached to the instructional system and method. Hon does not specifically disclose operation, troubleshooting or maintenance of these medical device items. However, Olson et al teaches an AED that has self-diagnostic capability as well as providing troubleshooting and device maintenance indicators and instructions (Figs 3 and 4). In attaching the instant AED to a rule-based expert system these troubleshooting, maintenance and diagnostic capabilities could be easily incorporated and displayed to the users in the same manner as any other system or method instructions. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to incorporate the existing utility, operation, troubleshooting and maintenance instructions of all medical devices to be connected to the rule-based expert system.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed September 12, 2002 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Although generating a feedback information loop indicating the correctness on the use of the medical device may not have been fully disclosed by Hon, it is common and well-known practice to utilize feedback for the correction of aberrations in the use of a plurality of devices. This is an obvious extension of the feedback information disclosed by Hon.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John L Sotomayor whose telephone number is 703-305-4558. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30-4:00 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tom Hughes can be reached on 703-308-1806. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-7768 for regular communications and 703-308-7768 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-4558.



Joe H. Cheng
Primary Examiner

jls

November 20, 2002